UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,355	04/02/2001	Edward J. Gottsman	05222.00108	7180

30498 7590 11/27/2006

ACCENTURE
C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 NORTH LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER	
CORRIELUS, JEAN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/824,355	GOTTSMAN, EDWARD J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jean M. Corrielus	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on June 26, 2006, in which claims 1-18 are pending for further examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. (See Examiner remark).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May et al., (hereinafter "May") in view of Takeda US Patent 6,867,788.

As to claim 1, May discloses the claimed "displaying, in a matrix area on the display, a matrix having a plurality of cells and a plurality of icons displayed one or more of the cells" (see fig.2; col.18, lines 7-17; Fig.1A-Fig.1E has a matrix area (101) having a plurality of cells (cell 1-12) and a plurality of icons displayed in one or more of the cells (specials; money; news; reference; program guide; col.5, lines 27-47; col.6, lines 44-63; col.7, lines 1-25; col.26, lines 60-65; col.24, lines 49-51); "receiving an icon selection signal in response to a user selecting one of the icons with the user interface selection device" by performing a searching function on the cells

displayed matrix to provide access to the database (col.12, lines 7-25; col.18, lines 52-66); and "in response to the icon selection signal displaying a corresponding element" (col.18, lines 45-58; col.19, lines 9-45). May does not explicitly the use wherein the matrix displaying row headings and column heading and each icon corresponding to an element in the database. However, May discloses a database system, which attributes for the various objects used in the preferred implementation of the matrix architecture user interface in an object oriented environment. It is noted, however, such database disclosed by May has used to store information in tables rows and columns of data and conducts searches by using data in specified columns of one table to find additional data in another table. Applicant should duly note that in conducting searches, the database matches information in a corresponding field of another table to produce a third table that combines requested data from both tables (see May's fig.12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to modify May's system, wherein the database system provided therein (see May's fig.12). On the other hand, Takeda discloses an matrix arrangement like a spiral view string, wherein m view is provided in a column and n views in a row, wherein the superimposition corresponds to the subsequence of views having the same number (col.7, lines 40-54). This implication provides that the matrix includes row and column headings. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the matrix architecture provided therein, (see May's fig.2) would incorporate the use wherein the matrix displaying row headings and column heading and each icon corresponding to an element in the database, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Takeda. One having skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the

visually superimposing detailed data of Takeda in order to better assure the integrity of the analysis results, thereby enabling users to sequentially select desired views.

As to claim 2, May discloses the claimed features "wherein the row headings identify sources from which the elements are obtained, the column headings identifying subject matter to which the elements relate" (col.8, lines 5-60; fig.12).

As to claim 3, Takeda discloses the claimed features "changing a visually perceptive characteristic of one of the icons in response to step (b)" (col.2, lines 8-56; col.5, lines 1-14; col.6, lines 42-62; col.7, lines 1-17, lines 42-45).

As to claim 4, Takeda discloses the claimed "receiving from the user a search request input from a user input device" (col.2, lines 8-56; col.5, lines 1-14; col.6, lines 42-62; col.7, lines 1-17, lines 42-45); and "changing a visually perceptive characteristic of icons that correspond to elements that satisfy the search request" (col.2, lines 8-56; col.5, lines 1-14; col.6, lines 42-62; col.7, lines 1-17, lines 42-45).

As to claim 5, May discloses the claimed feature "periodically changing, without intervention by the user, the element that is displayed" (col.12, lines 30-39).

As to claim 6, May discloses the claimed feature "wherein the element comprises a textual image" (col.9, lines 35-47).

As to claim 7, the limitations of claim 7 have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, May discloses the claimed feature "wherein the element comprises a textual excerpt" (col.9, lines 35-47).

As to claim 8, May discloses the claimed feature "displaying in a title relating to the element" (col.5, lines 27-47); and "displaying in a source location a source of the element" (col.12, lines 15-25).

As to claim 9, Takeda discloses the claimed "wherein the user selects the icon by superimposing a pointing indicator on the icon" (col.2, lines 8-56; col.5, lines 1-14; col.6, lines 42-62; col.7, lines 1-17, lines 42-45).

As to claim 16, Takeda discloses the claimed "displaying a textual excerpt in a text location on the display corresponding to a user selected on the icons" " (col.2, lines 8-56; col.5, lines 1-14; col.6, lines 42-62; col.7, lines 1-17, lines 42-45).

As to claim 17, May discloses the claimed feature "displaying each of the plurality of icons corresponding to an element in the database without text in the icon" (col.9, lines 35-47; 50-63; col.19, lines 1-35; col.18, lines 20-38, lines 55-67)

As to claim 18, Takeda discloses the claimed "displaying each icons corresponding to all data elements included in the database and a plurality of cells to visually indicate the distribution of

data in the database" (col.2, lines 8-56; col.5, lines 1-14; col.6, lines 42-62; col.7, lines 1-17, lines 42-45).

As to claims 10-15

Claims 10-15 are directed to computer readable medium for executing the method of claims 1-9 and 16-18, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

Remark

5. Applicant asserted (Remark's pages 7 and 8) that May fails to teach the matrix including displayed row and column headings; and the Takeda's reference fails to teach that a matrix comprising a row and column heading. The examiner has carefully considered the subject matter as arguments by the Applicant, the rejections advanced by the examiner, and the evidence of obviousness relied upon by examiner as support for the rejections. In rejecting the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103, it is incumbent upon the examiner to establish a factual basis to support the legal conclusion of obviousness and to provide a reason why one having ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have been led to modify the prior art or to combine prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention. Such reason must stem from some teaching, suggestion or implication in the prior art as a whole or knowledge generally available to one having ordinary skill in the art. These showings by the examiner are an essential part of complying with the burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. The examiner's position (detailed action, pages 2-7) that May discloses a plurality cell and plurality of icon in a matrix. May, however, does not explicitly disclose the use of a row and column heading in a matrix. To overcome these deficiencies of

May, the examiner turns to Takeda for having a row and column, which is part of a matrix. From the review of May and Takeda, the examiner has provided that applied prior art would have suggested to an artisan the invention as claimed. In addition, May discloses the claimed "displaying, in a matrix area on the display, a matrix having a plurality of cells and a plurality of icons displayed one or more of the cells" (see fig.2; col.18, lines 7-17; Fig.1A-Fig.1E has a matrix area (101) having a plurality of cells (cell 1-12) and a plurality of icons displayed in one or more of the cells (specials; money; news; reference; program guide; col.5, lines 27-47; col.6, lines 44-63; col.7, lines 1-25; col.26, lines 60-65; col.24, lines 49-51); "receiving an icon selection signal in response to a user selecting one of the icons with the user interface selection device" by performing a searching function on the cells displayed matrix to provide access to the database (col.12, lines 7-25; col.18, lines 52-66); and "in response to the icon selection signal displaying a corresponding element" (col.18, lines 45-58; col.19, lines 9-45). May does not explicitly the use wherein the matrix displaying row headings and column heading and each icon corresponding to an element in the database. However, May discloses a database system, which attributes for the various objects used in the preferred implementation of the matrix architecture user interface in an object oriented environment. It is noted, however, such database disclosed by May has used to store information in tables rows and columns of data and conducts searches by using data in specified columns of one table to find additional data in another table. Applicant should duly note that in conducting searches, the database matches information in a corresponding field of another table to produce a third table that combines requested data from both tables (see May's fig.12). The examiner finds that May fails to teach that a matrix including displayed row and column headings. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to modify May's system, wherein the database system provided therein (see May's fig.12). On the other hand, Takeda discloses an matrix arrangement like a spiral view string, wherein m view is provided in a column and n views in a row, wherein the superimposition corresponds to the subsequence of views having the same number (col.7, lines 40-54). This implication provides that the matrix includes row and column headings. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the matrix architecture provided therein, (see May's fig.2) would incorporate the use wherein the matrix displaying row headings and column heading and each icon corresponding to an element in the database, in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Takeda. One having skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the visually superimposing detailed data of Takeda in order to better assure the integrity of the analysis results, thereby enabling users to sequentially select desired views. The examiner has cogently explained the reason why May and Takeda are being relied upon and so the teachings and suggestions of May and Takeda would have suggested to an artisan the language of the claimed invention.

Therefore, claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious by May and Takeda describes all of the elements of the claimed invention so as to have placed a person of ordinary skill in the art in possession thereof. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean M. Corrielus whose telephone number is (571) 272-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 hours shift.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jean M Corrielus
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162

August 29, 2006